

ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION

Morris Printing Group, Inc. v. Americas Ghost Writer
Case No. D2026-2050

1. The Parties

The Complainant is Morris Printing Group, Inc., United States of America (“United States” or “U.S.”), represented by McGrath North Mullin & Kratz, PC LLO, United States.

The Respondent is Americas Ghost Writer, United States.

2. The Domain Name and Registrar

The disputed domain name <morrispublisher.com> is registered with NameCheap, Inc. (the “Registrar”).

3. Procedural History

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on May 13, 2026. On May 13, 2026, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On May 14, 2026, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (Privacy service provided by Withheld for Privacy ehf) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on May 14, 2026, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amendment to the Complaint on May 19, 2026.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amendment to the Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on May 21, 2026. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was June 10, 2026. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on June 11, 2026.

The Center appointed Kathryn Lee as the sole panelist in this matter on June 12, 2026. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

4. Factual Background

The Complainant is a printing company based in Kearney, Nebraska, United States. The Complainant was founded in 1933 as a print shop, and has expanded to now serve diverse markets in the United States, including fundraising cookbooks, school planners, classroom books, self-publishing, and commercial printing services. The Complainant has owned and used the domain name <morrispublishing.com> as its official website since June 19, 1996. Further, the Complainant owns trademark registrations to the following marks:

- MORRIS PUBLISHING (U.S. Trademark Registration Number 3656821; registered on July 21, 2009);
- MORRIS PUBLISHING (U.S. Trademark Registration Number 8156802; registered on March 3, 2026);
- MORRIS PRESS (U.S. Trademark Registration Number 3656819; registered on July 21, 2009); and
- MP (stylized) (U.S. Trademark Registration Number 8156950; registered on March 3, 2026).

Based on information from the Registrar, the Respondent is “Americas Ghost Writer” with an address in the United States.

The disputed domain name was registered on March 18, 2026, and at the time of the filing of the Complaint, resolved to a website displaying the Complainant’s MP stylized mark, images and contents from the Complainant’s official website, and advertising book related goods and services.

5. Parties’ Contentions

A. Complainant

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is identical or confusingly similar to the MORRIS based marks in which it has rights due to the shared dominant term MORRIS.

Next, the Complainant contends that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name, and that there is no evidence that the Respondent has been commonly known by the disputed domain name. The Complainant also contends that the Respondent’s use of the disputed domain name was intended to misappropriate the goodwill associated with the Complainant’s marks, rather than for use in connection with a bona fide offering of goods or services.

Finally, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. Specifically, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is connected to a website offering online retail store services such as sale printing graphic design and book publishing services that directly compete with the Complainant’s online retail store services. The Complainant further contends that the Respondent improperly used the Complainant’s registered marks on the website, along with copyrighted works of the Complainant from the Complainant’s official website, and that such use misleads consumers into believing that the website at the disputed domain name is affiliated with, sponsored by, or endorsed by the Complainant, when in fact no such relationship exists.

B. Respondent

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant's contentions.

6. Discussion and Findings

A. Identical or Confusingly Similar

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trademark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Select UDRP Questions ("[WIPO Overview 3.1](#)"), section 1.7.

The Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trademark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.2.1.

The disputed domain name shares the "morris" element with the Complainant's marks, and the "publisher" in the disputed domain name is very close to "PUBLISHING" in the Complainant's mark MORRIS PUBLISHING. Therefore, the Panel finds the mark is recognizable within the disputed domain name, and accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 1.7.

The Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

B. Rights or Legitimate Interests

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

Although the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving that a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the difficult task of "proving a negative", requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name (although the burden of proof always remains on the complainant). If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

The disputed domain name is connected to a copycat website using the Complainant's marks, copyrights, and essentially the same layout and banner as the Complainant's website advertising the same exact products and services as the Complainant. Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity – here, claimed passing off – can never confer rights or legitimate interests on a respondent. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 2.13.1.

The Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith

The Panel notes that, for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular, but without limitation, that, if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent linked the disputed domain name to a website copying the Complainant's website and claiming to be "Morris Publisher" which is confusingly similar to the Complainant's trademark. Further, the website was used to advertise the same exact products and services as the Complainant. Therefore, it is quite clear that the Respondent targeted the Complainant when registering and using the disputed domain name, and further, there can be no reason for such use than to intentionally attempted to attract, for commercial gain, Internet users by creating a likelihood of confusion with the complainant's mark. Adding to this, the Respondent failed to submit any explanation for registering the disputed domain name nor its use of the disputed domain name in this manner.

In addition, Panels have held that the use of a domain name for illegitimate activity – here, claimed copycat sites and passing off – constitutes bad faith. [WIPO Overview 3.1](#), section 3.4. Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Respondent's registration and use of the disputed domain name constitute bad faith under the Policy.

The Panel finds that the Complainant has established the third element of the Policy.

7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <morrispublisher.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

/Kathryn Lee/

Kathryn Lee

Sole Panelist

Date: June 24, 2026